Evaluation of the Indianapolis Mayor Sponsored Charter Schools

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South,

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy &

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4th Year Charter Review of the Second School Charter

2014-2015 School Year

Mary Jo Rattermann, Ph.D.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION INNOVATION

Office of the Mayor of Indianapolis

FOURTH YEAR CHARTER REVIEW

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South,

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy &

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

November 3-7, 2014

The Indianapolis Mayor's Office Fourth Year Charter Review (FYCR) is designed to assess the development of the school as it finishes its sixth year of operation, and serves as an evaluation of the school now that it is well established. The Fourth Year Charter Review Protocol is based on the *Performance Framework*, which is used to determine a school's success relative to a common set of indicators, as well as school-based goals.

Consistent with the Indianapolis Mayor's Office Performance Framework, the following four core questions and sub-questions are examined to determine a school's success:

Is the educational program a success?
   1.1. Is the school's academic performance meeting state expectation, as measured by Indiana's accountability system?
   1.2. Are students making sufficient and adequate gains, as measured by the Indiana Growth model?
   1.3. Does the school demonstrate that students are improving, the longer they are enrolled at the school?
   1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to students of all races and socioeconomic backgrounds?
   1.5. Is the school's attendance rate strong?
   1.6. Is the school outperforming schools that the students would have been assigned to attend?
   1.7. Is the school meeting its school-specific educational goals?

Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
   2.1. Short term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?
   2.2. Long term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long term financial health?
   2.3. Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?

Is the organization effective and well-run?
   3.1. Is the school leader strong in his or her academic and organizational leadership?
   3.2. Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its organizational structure and governance obligations?
   3.3. Is the school's board active, knowledgeable and abiding by appropriate policies, systems and processes in its oversight?

3.4. Does the school's board work to foster a school environment that is viable and effective?

3.5. Does the school comply with applicable laws, regulations and provision of the charter agreement relating to the safety and security of the facility?

Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success*?*

4.1. *Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?*

4.2. *Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?*

4.3. *For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?*

4.4. *Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?*

4.5. *Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?*

4.6. *Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?*

4.7. *Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?*

4.8. *Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?*

4.9 *Is the school properly maintaining special education files for its special needs students?*

4.10 *Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to English as Second Language (ESL) students?*

COMPLETION OF THE FOURTH YEAR CHARTER REVIEW

As part of its oversight of charter schools, the Mayor's Office of Education Innovation has authorized Research & Evaluation Resources (RER) to conduct site visits of schools in their sixth year of operation. The purpose is to present the school and the OEI a professional judgment on conditions and practices at the school, which are best provided through an external perspective. This report uses multiple sources of evidence to understand the school's performance. Evidence collection begins with a review of key documents and continues on-site through additional document review, classroom visits and interviews with any number of stakeholders. Findings provided by the site visits can be used to celebrate what the school is doing well and prioritize its areas for improvement in preparation for renewal. It is the task of the site visit team to report on the following pre-identified aspects of the *Performance Framework* and to assist OEI in its completion of the FYCR Protocol: *Responses to sub-questions 4.1- 4.10 of Core Question 4.*

The outcome of this review will provide the school with a written report that includes a judgment and supporting evidence on various aspects of the school, based on a of indicators[1] developed for each of the four core questions and sub-questions in the *Performance Framework*. The assessment system utilizes the following judgments:

Does not meet standard

Approaching standard

Meets standard

---

[1] Rubric indicators are subject to revision by the OEI.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School opened in 2004 as part of the Lighthouse Academies, Inc. network of schools. Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School began as a school for students from grades K through 8, and in 2009 added the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy for students grade 9-12. In 2014, a building expansion of the south side school was completed, and approximately 250 new students joined the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School. Many of these students were transfers from the recently closed Monument Lighthouse Charter School that was located on the east side of Indianapolis. The closure of Monument Lighthouse Charter School also resulted in the opening of a new middle school site for the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School housed in the form Monument Lighthouse building. This site, Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East, has applied for it's own charter from the Office of Education Innovation with the goal of being an additional school in the Lighthouse Academies network in the 2015-16 school year.

All Indianapolis Lighthouse schools share the Lighthouse Academies mission of providing students with the opportunity to "discover, achieve, and prepare for success in college, incorporating an arts-infused philosophy" through a curriculum that engages students' critical decision-making skills. A stated goal of Lighthouse Academies is to provide students with a rigorous academic experience through the implementation of an extended school year (190 days) and an extended school day. Lighthouse Academy schools also have as part of their mission the use of assessment data and tools to inform instruction and to identify areas of growth to increase student achievement. Finally, to accommodate different learning styles, classroom instruction includes a mix of whole-class, small group and individual work.

Lighthouse Academies also addresses the "social/emotional and soft skills" of Lighthouse students through the implementation of a character driven school culture. Using the five character traits of SHINE (Self-Discipline, Humility, Intelligence, Nobility, Excellence) program, Lighthouse Schools support students' social skills through their "Habits of Scholars" program. The Habits of Scholars focus on the areas of active community membership, critical thinking, effective communication, and self-direction and management. Lighthouse Schools also focus on arts infusion, with teachers infusing art activities and techniques into the instruction of all core subjects.

The Evaluation Process

Research & Evaluation Resources staff engaged in a number of evidence-collecting activities. The focus of this evaluation was to gauge perceptions of key stakeholders at the school in relation to the areas of the performance framework that are part of the evaluation. RER conducted focus group discussions with students, staff, and parents, as well as interviews with the school administration. These focus groups, interviews and classroom observations for Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Schools were conducted over a 5 day period, November 3-7, 2014. Each school will be evaluated separately on the standards that apply specifically to each school, such as the quality of classroom instruction. Standards and indicators are listed with relevant evidence that was used to determine the

recommended rating. Following the discussion of each indicator, a summary of strengths and areas for attention are provided for the core question.

On November 3 & 4, 2014, two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South. Classroom observers spent 3.87 hours (232 minutes) observing 8 classrooms, 171 students, and 8 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 28 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 21:1. Two of the teachers were observed by both classroom observers at the same time in order to ensure inter-judge reliability. Please see the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East Classroom Observation Summary for a detailed analysis of the observations conducted. Focus groups and interviews with school leadership and parents were conducted on November 3 & 4, 2014, and took place at the school.

On November 4 & 5, 2014, two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy. Classroom observers spent 3 hours (174 minutes) observing 6 classrooms, 222 students, and 6 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 29 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 22:1. Two of the teachers were observed by both classroom observers at the same time in order to ensure inter-judge reliability. Please see the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy Classroom Observation Summary for a detailed analysis of the observations conducted. Focus groups and interviews with school leadership and parents were conducted on November 4 & 5, 2014, and took place at the school.

On November 6 & 7, 2014, two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East. Classroom observers spent 4.6 hours (279 minutes) observing 9 classrooms, 159 students, and 9 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 31 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 18:1. Please see the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East Classroom Observation Summary for a detailed analysis of the observations conducted. Focus groups and interviews with school leadership and parents were conducted on November 6 & 7, 2014, and took place at the school.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

INDIANAPOLIS LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL-SOUTH, INDIANAPOLIS LIGHTHOUSE COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMY, & INDIANAPOLIS LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL-EAST

Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?	Finding
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South *4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East *4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy *4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?*	**Approaches Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South *4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?*	**Approaches Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East *4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?*	**Approaches Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy *4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?*	**Does Not Meet Standard**
4.3 For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South *4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East *4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy *4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South *4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East *4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy *4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?*	**Does Not Meet Standard**
4.6. Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South *4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?*	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East *4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?*	**Approaches Standard**

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy _4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?_	**Does Not Meet Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South _4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?_	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East _4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?_	**Meets Standard**
Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy _4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?_	**Meets Standard**
4.9 Is the school properly maintaining special education files for its special needs students?	**Does Not Meet Standard**
4.10 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to English as Second Language (ESL) students?	**Not Applicable**

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

	4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Meets standard	**The school: a) curriculum aligns with the state standards; b) conducts systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school regularly reviews scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) has a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on the core learning objectives; e) the staff understands and uniformly uses curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction; f) programs and materials are available to deliver the curriculum effectively.**

No significant concerns were found.

Data gathered through classroom observations, focus group interviews and interviews with the school leadership revealed that the curriculum being enacted at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South (ILCS-South) is standards-based and aligns with the Indiana State Standards (indicator a). Focus group interviews with the teaching staff, as well as interviews with Kim Randall, the Principal of the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South and Steve Harrison, Assistant Principal of Instruction, revealed that the school leadership and teaching staff have adapted the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South curriculum to the new state standards.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South currently uses Envision Math and Reading Street curriculums. Interviews with Mrs. Randall and Mr. Harrison revealed that the teaching staff and the school leadership began the process of cross-walking to the new Indiana State Standards in mid-July of 2014, and did not have access to Acuity data until after that date. Consequently, there are no blueprints for reading and math this year and a variety of curriculum mapping practices were used during this academic year to map out the school's curriculum. Specifically, the teaching staff met as grade level teams to develop the initial curriculum mappings. These initial mappings were then given to the grade levels teams that were one grade up for their review, and to inform them of what their students were taught in the previous grade. This vertical analysis ensures that there is a vertical alignment between the standards being taught in each grade. The curriculum maps were then shared

with department head for their feedback on the quality of the curriculum and the depth of the coverage of the state standards. Finally, the curriculum maps were shared with the ILCS-South leadership team for feedback. Once their feedback was addressed, the curriculum maps were finished. In a final check of vertical alignment, the 6th grade curriculum maps were shared with the 7th grade teachers at the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Charter Academy (ILCPA), ensuring that the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas is prioritized and focused on core learning objectives (indicator d).

Mr. Harrison provided more details of the curriculum process, explaining that the mapping of the new Indiana State Standards to the curriculum began with the staff considering what "makes the most sense for the child to learn," and moved ahead from there. Specifically, at each grade level the teaching staff examined the new state standards and mapped out what needed to be taught and when it needed to be taught to ensure that critical information is presented to students in time for testing (indicator c).

Mr. Harrison noted that the textbooks were chosen by the Lighthouse Academies, Inc. network, and that they are Common Core textbooks. To adapt the class to the Indiana State Standards, Mr. Harrison encouraged the teaching staff to find the best resources for student learning from a variety of sources. As for the exact curriculum mapping process, Mr. Harrison stated that "they worked on the sequence (of the state standards) and built around the standards together as a team. We created the unit plans and then we created the curriculum map. Our goal was to look for the big picture. We asked a set of questions as we worked-- What are we teaching? When are we teaching it? How is it reflective of the central questions? When those questions were answered we moved into working on the specific lesson plans."

The process for designing the curriculum maps for the 2014-15 academic year was complicated by the fact that ILCS-South did not receive the new state standards until relatively late. In order to adapt to this timing, the ILCS-South staff divided the curriculum into quarters and worked using a "just in time" model-- finishing the curriculum map for the upcoming quarter as they were teaching the current one. The ILCS-South leadership and teaching staff used the morning professional development time to develop the curriculum maps. Once the maps were completed, they were submitted to the department heads: the K-2 department head for math and reading, and the 3-6 Math and 3-6 English Language Arts department heads. After the curriculum maps were reviewed, time was spent as a learning community during afternoon professional development time two days a week to review and discuss the new curriculum. Mr. Harrison noted that next year they will have the chance to revise the curriculum maps relying on both the Indiana State Standards and ISTEP and Acuity data to drive the revision and conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance (indicator b). The teaching staff also commented on the use of data during curriculum revision, noting that "we do grade level work and look at missed opportunities, as well as course goals, using class-wide and school-wide data to figure out what the school is doing poorly in. We use personal practices as teachers, and the standards and indicators, and we adjust the curriculum." Mr. Harrison also noted that as a school they will have more data available and will use

that data more intentionally in the future curriculum mapping process to determine critical learning objectives and sequencing of information for ILCS-South students.

Classroom and informal observations during the site visit revealed that the ILCS-South staff uses program materials provided by the curriculum to effectively deliver instruction (indicator e). The quality of the curriculum maps ranged from good to outstanding, and the lesson plans exhibited a similar range of quality. Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South has provided teachers with a good environment within which to teach. All of the classrooms observed contained the programs and materials to deliver the curriculum effectively (indicator f). When asked about the availability of materials, the teaching staff expressed satisfaction with the materials and support from ILCS-South leadership. The staff specifically noted that "we have the materials we need to teach, and technology isn't an issue for us. We have materials enough to teach." Another noted that "we have a huge amount of resources—we have all we need.. The tech is good, although there are some times where a SmartBoard is not working well. But for the everyday situations they have access to COWS (Computers on Wheels) and those work well."

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Academy-South has adopted a standards-based curriculum that provides the teaching staff with a wealth of opportunities to develop a strong curriculum that meets the needs of their students.

Processes are in place for the ILCS-South teaching staff to continue to modify and adapt the Envision and Reading Street curriculums to the needs of the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South students.

Recommendations: School leaders, and in particular the Assistant Principal of Instruction, should continue to monitor the process of adapting the Envision and Reading Street curriculum to the needs of the ILCS students.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

	4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Meets standard	**The school: a) curriculum aligns with the state standards; b) conducts systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school regularly reviews scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) has a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on the core learning objectives; e) the staff understands and uniformly uses curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction; f) programs and materials are available to deliver the curriculum effectively.**

No significant concerns were found.

Data gathered through classroom observations, focus group interviews and interviews with the school leadership revealed that the curriculum being enacted at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East (ILCS-East) is standards-based and aligns with the Indiana State Standards (indicator a). Focus group interviews with the teaching staff, as well as interviews with Steve Pelych, the Principal of the ILCS-East and Spencer Fort, Assistant Principal of Instruction, revealed that the school leadership and teaching staff have adapted the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East curriculum to the new state standards.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East currently uses Envision Math and Reading Street curriculums. The teaching staff and the school leadership began the process of cross-walking to the new Indiana State Standards in mid-July of 2014, and did not have access to Acuity data until after that date. Mr. Spencer Fort, Assistant Principal of Instruction, described a process driven by Understanding by Design, in which the process of "backward design" drives the development of clear educational goals and assessments to measure those goals. Part of the UBD backward design process is the use of student achievement data to help form educational goals to be incorporated into the curriculum maps, ensuring that the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas is prioritized and focused on core learning objectives (indicator d). During the time period in which the current curriculum maps were being developed, however, the current Acuity data was not

available. In order to make progress on mapping their curriculum to the current state standards, Mr. Fort and the ILCS-East staff used student data from the previous year, exclusively examining data from students returning to ILCS-East. Using this limited data set, the backward design of the curriculum could continue. Mr. Fort noted, however, that the current Acuity data will be used to make further adjustments and fine tuning to the curriculum, probably during the one day a month set aside for professional development (indicator b). Mr. Fort noted that the delay in the release of the state standards, as well as the delay in the Acuity data left them in acting in "a reactive way, which is where we don't want to be. We want to be proactive next year and that's why really looking at the data this summer is very important." The teaching staff noted that the use of Acuity data has not waited until next summer, explaining how they are using the first round of Acuity data to " take my curriculum map and evaluate how the process went this past year. In years past, we've always had the "Acuity Blueprint," which informed what standards we needed to teach and when we needed to teach them. When the state released the "Critical Standards" that further informed the curriculum evaluation. Our weekly assessments also allow us to generate performance data that contributes to the process of evaluating curriculum. I know myself, I've used the work we've done this week, to the day, to inform how I need to teach the current curricular content."

Mr. Fort also shared that it is his responsibility to provide his colleagues with up to date information regarding policies and procedures of the Indiana Department of Education, and that he attends all the DOE informational meetings to ensure the ILCS staff and leadership are aware of any changes, particularly changes to the state-wide assessments. Thus, Mr. Fort is able to review the school-wide curriculum to ensure that critical information is presented to students in time for testing (indicator c). In addition to his knowledge of the state-assessments, Mr. Fort's knowledge of backward design also ensures that state standards are covered in time for testing, given that determining goals and assessments occurs before developing the pacing of the course and the content of the lesson plans.

Classroom observations and informal observations during the site visit revealed that the ILCS-East staff uses program materials provided by the curriculum to effectively deliver instruction (indicator e). The quality of the curriculum maps ranged from good to outstanding, and the lesson plans exhibited a similar range of quality. Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has provided teachers with a good environment within which to teach. All of the classrooms observed contained the programs and materials to deliver the curriculum effectively (indicator f). When asked about the availability of materials, the teaching staff expressed satisfaction with the materials and support provided by Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Academy-East.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Academy-East has adopted a standards-based curriculum that provides the teaching staff with a wealth of opportunities to develop a strong curriculum that meets the needs of their students.

Processes are in place for the ILCS-East teaching staff to continue to modify and adapt the curriculum to the needs of the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East students.

Recommendations: School leaders, and in particular the Assistant Principal of Instruction, should continue to monitor the process of adapting the curriculum to the needs of the ILCS-East students.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.
Approaching standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum does not align with the state standards; b) the school does not conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school does not regularly review scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) the sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas does not focus on core (prioritized) learning objectives; e) the staff lacks understanding and/or consensus as to how the curriculum documents and related program materials are used to effectively deliver instruction; f) there is a lack of programs and materials available to deliver the curriculum effectively.**
Meets standard	The school: a) curriculum aligns with the state standards; b) conducts systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance; c) the school regularly reviews scope and sequence to ensure presentation of content in time for testing; d) has a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on the core learning objectives; e) the staff understands and uniformly uses curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction; f) programs and materials are available to deliver the curriculum effectively.

Significant concerns were found in indicator f.

Data gathered through classroom observations, focus group interviews and interviews with the school leadership revealed that the curriculum being enacted at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy (ILCPA) is standards-based and aligns with the Indiana State Standards (indicator a). Joel Thomas, Assistant Principal for Instruction, explained that, like ILCS-East, the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy uses Understanding by Design as part of curriculum development. The process used at ILCPA is a UBD design that has been adapted to meet the needs of Lighthouse Academy students. According to Mr. Thomas, the first step is to group the Indiana State Standards thematically in order to detect the objectives of the standards, e.g. in English Language Arts, the different examples of, and uses for, tone in writing. An additional objective of this exercise was to ensure that the staff understands the Indiana State Standards at a very deep conceptual level. The next step in the "backward planning" of the UBD model was to design the assessments to be used to assess the thematic objectives. The staff was given examples of possible formats to be used for the assessments, as well as given guidance on the design of additional authentic assessments to be given during class. Each assessment was broken down into skills and knowledge components based on the UDB concepts of enduring understandings and essential questions. After the assessments were designed, any large projects that would benefit the students' understanding of the learning objectives are designed. Once these assessments and projects

were designed, they were formed into unit plans, and then into curriculum maps. The inclusion of the UBD enduring understandings and essential questions ensures that the curriculum maps are prioritized and focused on core learning objectives across grade levels and content areas (indicator d). The teaching staff is fully engaged in the backwards planning of the curriculum, noting that "we want to design the curriculum and find out what we can with it, and how we can align it to the standards." They also agreed that using the Understanding by Design process is "a best practice, and it helps our students. It's hard to plan a unit before the lesson plans----you don't know how long it will last---but it is working for us." Finally, one teacher explained "We look at the assessments we've designed, and then we backwards plan. It helps us to keep the pacing right, and we can tell the students this where we are and this is where we need to be, and it helps the students to pace themselves and remember the end goal."

The systematic review of the curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance (indicator b), as well as the review of the scope and sequence in time for testing (indicator c) occurs within the backwards planning UBD process. The curriculum maps are designed as three 7-week units, with daily exit slips centered around essential questions, bi-weekly scrimmages, and end-of-unit assessments. These classroom assessments provide real time data on students' progress that can be used to revise and refine the unit and lesson plans. Data from Acuity is also used to loop back and reteach a standard that students are performing poorly on, or to revise and adjust the upcoming unit plan to address any standards that the students may be lacking. Finally, at the end of each set of units the curriculum map is adjusted based on past student performance.

Classroom observations and informal observations during the site visit revealed that the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy staff uses program materials provided by the curriculum to effectively deliver instruction (indicator e). The quality of the curriculum maps ranged from good to outstanding, and the lesson plans exhibited a similar range of quality. Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy has provided teachers with many of the programs and materials needed to deliver the curriculum effectively (indicator f), however, the teaching staff expressed some reservations regarding the quality of the technology available. They described a situation in which "the computers are off and on. The one-to-one computers are slow. They're not that old...they are just awful computers." Another teacher explained "they are in a COW in the back of the room. We don't use them because they take 20 minutes to boot up." The lack of support for the Smartboards and the computers was also noted, with one teacher explaining that "there is one guy for IT for three campuses. He works very hard, but he needs some help." The current situation was summed up by one teacher as "we have up to date textbooks, SmartBoards that don't work and no one with time to fix them, and the computers are there but there is no point because we can't use them." On the positive side, the staff did appreciate that "we have a lot of websites available and they have different programs for the students. Accessing them when the computers work has been great."

Areas of Strength: Processes are in place to develop a strong curriculum through the application of backward planning and Understanding by Design.

Recommendations: Encourage the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy teaching staff to continue updating and revising their curriculum maps.

Additional support for Educational Technology is needed in order to make the one-to-one computer initiative a success.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.
Approaching standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.**
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the curriculum is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possesses the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) supplies sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices.

 Significant concerns were found in indicator d.

Classroom observations revealed that the curriculum at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design (indicator a), with all 8 out of 8 teachers observed followed the provided lesson plan. The lesson plans were provided using PlanBook, an web-based teacher planning tool. In addition to the lesson plans of the classrooms observed, lesson plans from a random sample of instructors were examined. The lesson plans reviewed were of very high quality, with the state standards to be covered clearly noted.   The amount of detail varied among the lesson plans, but all of the provided enough detail regarding the state standards being covered or the learning objectives for that day to be useful guiding documents. Many of the teachers took full advantage of the web-based platform to plan their lessons, including hotlinks to additional documents, pictures of students engaged in the activities to be done that day, as well as pictures of materials to be used in class. Many of the lesson plans were extremely detailed and very well done. It was also noted that all of the lesson plans contained core learning objectives in the form of "Students will be able to" (SWBAT). These core-learning objectives all aligned to the state standard being covered for that day.

Classroom observations also revealed that, as delivered, the majority of instruction is focused on core learning objectives (indicator b). As noted above, the majority of the lesson plans provided by the teacher who were observed did contain core-learning objectives, and the classroom observations revealed that all of the instructors did deliver a lesson focused on learning objectives.   The

classroom observations revealed that four of the eight instructors observed gave lessons that posed a challenge to students and possessed the appropriate rigor (indicator c).

The instructors at ILCS-South relied on direct instruction in all of the classrooms observed (indicator d). None of the instructors were observed to either differentiate instruction based on student level or include differentiation strategies in their lesson plans. Differentiating instruction needs to be a focus of professional development at ILCS-South.

Teacher interviews noted that the school leaders provided regular feedback on their curriculum map and lesson plans, and meet with the staff monthly by grade level to ensure that the curriculum is responsive to any changes that need to be made in response to student data (indicator e).   The content of lessons is monitored through a series of formal and informal classroom walkthroughs performed by the ILCS-South leadership team.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South has a strong teaching staff, who present rigorous and challenging content throughout the school.

Instruction at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South is data-driven. Teachers receive timely and accurate data regarding student performance, and they use that data in curricular planning.

School leadership conduct frequent classroom observations, and use that data to improve instruction.

Recommendations: Providing additional support and training for the staff in differentiating instruction should be a focus at ILCS-South.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

	4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.
Approaching standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.**
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the curriculum is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possesses the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) supplies sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices.

Significant concerns were found in indicator d.

Classroom observations revealed that the curriculum at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design (indicator a), with 8 out of 9 teachers observed followed the provided lesson plan, with one lesson plan unavailable on Planbook.com. The lesson plans provided were all of very high quality, with the state standards to be covered clearly noted on all but one of the available lesson plans.   The amount of detail varied among the lesson plans, but all of the provided enough detail regarding the state standards being covered or the learning objectives for that day to be useful guiding documents. Many of the lesson plans were extremely detailed and very well done. It was also noted that all of the lesson plans contained core learning objectives in the form of "Students will be able to" (SWBAT). These core-learning objectives all aligned to the state standard being covered for that day.

Classroom observations also revealed that, as delivered, the majority of instruction is focused on core learning objectives (indicator b). As noted above, the available lesson plans provided by the teachers observed did contain core-learning objectives, and the classroom observations revealed that eight of the nine instructors did deliver a lesson focused on those objectives. The classroom observations revealed that eight of the nine instructors observed gave lessons that posed a challenge to students and possessed the appropriate rigor (indicator c).

The instructors at ILCS-East did not show a variety of different strategies in their teaching, with the observed instruction consisting of direct instruction and some group work (indicator d). Nine out of nine instructors did not differentiate instruction based on student level nor include differentiation strategies in their lesson plans. The lesson plans did contain suggestions for potential groupings of

students, but there was no explicit description of differentiation strategies to accompany these student groups. Differentiating instruction should be a focus of professional development at ILCS-East. In response to these concerns, Mr. Pelych has developed an action plan to provide more focus on small group instruction, including professional development in this topic. H has also adjusted the classroom walk-through form, and provided faculty with an opportunity to adjust their lesson plans to include strategies for differentiation, as well as time during staff meeting for lesson plan review.

Teacher interviews noted that the school leaders provided regular feedback on their curriculum maps and lesson plans, and meet with the staff monthly by grade level to ensure that the curriculum is responsive to any changes that need to be made in response to student data (indicator e). The content of lessons is monitored through a series of formal and informal classroom walkthroughs performed by the ILCS-East leadership team.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has a strong teaching staff, who present rigorous and challenging content throughout the school.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East is data-driven. Teachers receive timely and accurate data regarding student performance, and they use that data in curricular planning.

School leadership conduct frequent classroom observations, and use that data to improve instruction.

Recommendations: An increased focus on, and professional development in, differentiating instruction for all types of learners.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?	
Does not meet standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.**
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) the curriculum is not implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is not focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery lacks the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities lack variety and/or limited use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) staff do not receive feedback on instructional practices.
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the curriculum is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design; b) as delivered, instruction is focused on core learning objectives; c) the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possesses the appropriate rigor and challenge; d) instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning needs; e) supplies sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices.

Significant concerns were found in indicators b, c, d & e.

Classroom observations revealed that the curriculum at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy is implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design (indicator a), with 5 out of 6 teachers observed followed the provided lesson plan. The lesson plans provided were almost all of very high quality, with the state standards to be covered clearly noted. The amount of detail varied among the lesson plans, but all of the provided enough detail regarding the state standards being covered or the learning objectives for that day to be useful guiding documents. Many of the lesson plans were extremely detailed and very well done. It was also noted that all of the lesson plans contained core learning objectives in the form of "Students will be able to" (SWBAT) or learning objectives for the day. These core-learning objectives all aligned to the state standard being covered for that day.

Classroom observations revealed that, as delivered, the majority of instruction was not focused on core learning objectives (indicator b). As noted above, the majority of the lesson plans provided by the teacher who were observed did contain core-learning objectives, but in 3 out of the 6 observations performed the lack of classroom management made it impossible for the instructor to focus on these objectives. The classroom observations revealed that only 2 of the 6 instructors observed gave lessons that posed a challenge to students and possessed the appropriate rigor (indicator c), again, not because the lesson plans did not include rigorous content, assessments and learning objectives, but because the classroom instructor spend an inordinate amount of time disciplining students rather than teaching.

The use of differentiated instruction was observed in at least one classroom, however, as soon as the instructor attempted to differentiate and work with either individuals students or groups of students, the other students would lose focus and begin to talk or act out. Consequently, the teaching staff of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy may well be very skilled in differentiating instruction for all types of learners, but the current school climate does not allow them to engage in this best practice.

Teacher focus group comments on instructional feedback from the school leadership was mixed. Some instructors noted that they have yet to be observed during the current academic year, while other noted that they had been observed but that the feedback was sometimes not shared with the instructor evaluated, or if provided on Bloomboard the feedback was "confusing" (indicator e). Others noted that Bloomboard had not been fully explained to the staff, and that if there was feedback waiting for them on the website they were unable to access it.

Areas of Strength: The curriculum maps and lesson plans of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy are well-designed and provide a strong curriculum for the high school.

Recommendations: A focus on classroom management and school culture in future professional development.

An increased focus on, and professional development in, differentiating instruction for all types of learners.

Better communication with the teaching staff regarding the use of Bloomboard, and more consistent classroom observations with feedback regularly provided to the teaching staff.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

	4.3 For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options?
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in two or more of the following areas: a) the school's academic program lacks challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) there is a lack of high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) insufficient material resources and personnel guidance are available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) limited opportunities exist for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) the school does not meet Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in one of the following areas: a) the school's academic program lacks challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) there is a lack of high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) insufficient material resources and personnel guidance are available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) limited opportunities exist for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) the school does not meet Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.
Meets standard	The school: a) has challenging coursework (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for rigorous post-secondary opportunities; b) has high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities; c) has sufficient material resources and personnel guidance available to inform students of post-secondary options; d) presents opportunities for extracurricular engagement and activities (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options; e) meets or exceeds Indiana Core 40 graduation standard requirements.

No significant concerns were found.

Interviews with the Directors of College Transitions, Rachel Green-Sharpe & Rahul Jyoti revealed that Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy offers students the opportunity to take dual credit courses through Ivy Tech and UIPUI (indicator a). The faculty reports that the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy curriculum is designed so that all students will meet or exceed Indiana Core 40 graduation requirements (indicator e).

During the interview, Mr. Jyoti and Ms. Green-Sharpe described programs that are currently in place, and others that are being planned, to provide high expectations to motivate and prepare students for post-secondary academic opportunities (indicator b). ILCPA has recently instituted the Advisory Model for students and the College Transitions team and the teaching staff are making the most of the opportunities to build relationships with student that are offered by an Advisory model. The school has dedicated a full 50 minutes to Advisory and each member of the teaching staff is assigned to a group of students for Advisory. The expectation is that the staff will build relationships with students during Advisory, and will provide the students with the opportunity to think more about post-secondary options such as college or career training.

The Advisory is associated with a course that is being taught by that faculty member, such as digital citizenship, that is designed to allow students to work together, get to know their faculty advisor, and also explore important issues. One of the Advisories include activities that are relevant to college and career preparations, and Mr. Jyoti and Ms. Green-Sharpe have input into these activities. Preparation for the ACT is also part of the Advisories, and all students are encouraged to take the ACT.

 The Transitions team at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy goes above and beyond to ensure that students are aware of post-secondary options, and encourage students to have high goals (indicator c). Students at ILCPA go on quite a few college visits, with 10 campuses a conservative estimate of the schools visited.   These campus visits are often overnight trips that include many college visits over the course of 2 days. The college visits are not only for the high school students-- many of the 7th and 8th grade students go on college trips as well. As Mr. Jyoti explained "the younger kids may not even realize what a college campus is, but after the visit they know they want to go to college."

In addition to a full array of supports for post-secondary educational opportunities, ILCPA has also added more supports for students who want to pursue vocational educational opportunities. Mr. Jyotie and Ms. Green-Sharpe have begun working with Arsenal Technical High School to allow ILCPA students access to the VoTech courses available at Tech. They have arranged for a bus to provide transportation for students to Tech to take courses in VoTech courses such as Culinary arts, Fire Science, Dental programs, automotive repair and welding, among others.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy also provides a wealth of extracurricular activities to increase post-secondary options (indicator d) such as athletics, including baseball and basketball for both boys and girls, Cross Country, Soccer and Track and Field. Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy also offers academic clubs such as the National Honors Society, Spanish Club and the student newspaper.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy both encourages and celebrates their students in their higher-education goals.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy provides strong supports for students' secondary education goals throughout all four years of high school.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Meets standard	**The school: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are received by classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is sufficient frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse School-South administers standardized and classroom assessments that are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives (indicator a), and are administered with sufficient frequency to inform instructional decisions effectively (indicator d). Specifically, at the school-wide level, Acuity is administered three times a year, as well ISTEP, IREAD-3 and IREAD K-2. Additional assessments used are DIBELS, which are administered 3 times a year, and a full complement of regular classroom assessments, which when combined with the standardized testing, displays a sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of learning abilities (indicator c). Teachers noted in the focus group that the data is disseminated quickly and presented in a way that is useful for differentiating instruction and determining student weaknesses (indicator b). When asked about the use of data in the classroom the members of the ILCS-South teaching staff displayed a wide variety of engagement with the practices of data-driven instruction. Some teachers noted that they regularly use Acuity data, either recording the score as it reported immediately after testing, or by logging into the Acuity data management system in order to examine both individual and aggregate student scores. Others, however, replied that the use of data was the responsibility of the Title 1 team. These views suggest that additional professional development on data driven instruction would be of value to the ILCS-South teaching staff.

Acuity score data and reports are analyzed by the ILCS-South school leadership to determine "school-wide trends" in order to form school-wide goals (indicator e). A specific example of using

data to set goals comes from the use of Acuity data from the last round of testing. School leadership noted that the literacy scores were low and needed to be addressed. Consequently, all 3 school-wide goals at ILCS-South are centered on literacy. ILCS-South leadership and teaching staff are currently examining testing data to determine student level weaknesses in each indicator .

Another example of effective data use at ILCS-South is a practice of the "Teacher Tracker" that tracks student academic achievement and then aggregates the data to code classroom teachers as either "red," for needing targeted support, "yellow" for push-in supports, and "green" for teachers who could offer support to their colleagues. Each of the three Lighthouse schools use this system to track teachers performance in order to provide professional support to teachers who would benefit from additional training. At ILCS-South, the classroom level data is collected every two weeks and is color coded and recorded longitudinally on an excel spreadsheet such that patterns of performance are easy to detect.

Finally, ILCS-South, as well as the other Lighthouse Schools, uses assessment data very effectively in the determination of the CAP (Culture of Achievement Plan) goals for the year. For example, one of the CAP goals for the 2014-15 school year is " ELA proficiency will increase by 8 or more percentage points (equivalent of one year's growth) as measured on ISTEP," a goal that is based on current ISTEP data and the detected need to increase ELA proficiency.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South uses a wide-variety of standardized and classroom based assessments, and disseminates the data quickly and in a useful manner to the teaching staff.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South uses standardized assessment data to improve instruction at the school-wide curricular level and also at the student-level.

Recommendations: Not all of the teaching staff has embraced data-driven instruction-- additional school-wide professional development in the area of data use in the classroom would be beneficial.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Meets standard	**The school: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are received by classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is sufficient frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse School-South administers standardized and classroom assessments that are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives (indicator a), and are administered with sufficient frequency to inform instructional decisions effectively (indicator d). Specifically, at the school-wide level, Acuity is administered three times a year and ISTEP is administered once a year. A full complement of regular classroom assessments , which when combined with the standardized testing, displays a sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of learning abilities (indicator c).

Teachers noted in the focus group that the data is disseminated quickly and presented in a way that is useful for differentiating instruction and determining student weaknesses (indicator b). They also noted that school leadership provides them with the opportunity to engage with the data as a learning community during weekly data meetings. One teacher explained "Each week, we'll have our 'Data Meetings.' We're looking at comparing the week's standards to the week prior, seeing how students are faring on assessments, either formal or informal. See why kids are actually missing problems, looking at the issue vertically as well as horizontally. If I have a number of kids who missed this question on this assessment, I need to be reflective about my teaching and I need to ask myself how can I better address this topic so more students can succeed. We're pushing our kids and pushing ourselves. Another thing we try to push is making our students be accountable and own their own data. Taking that information and being reflective. Asking "Why" they're missing

certain problems, and "Why" their process isn't successful."

The teaching staff also noted that assessment results are regularly used to guide changes to the curriculum (indicator e), with one example being the Advisory Period. As one teacher explained, "Once a lot of these (student problem learning areas) are identified, we can look at opportunities to reteach. Giving the students more practice, more practice time. That's why the 'Advisory Period' is so important, because now we can provide reassessment/remediation/reteaching opportunities for our students within the framework of the school day. That's a modification that came from evaluating student performance." Another educational practice that came about through data use is the "fill-in" notes being used in many classrooms, and the opportunity for content area teachers to "push-in" to classrooms to provide remediation in their subject area. The practice of content area "push-in" required a change in teacher schedules, as noted in the focus groups discussions. The process was described by one teacher as, "One of the modifications we made, when we realized the amount of need, was teacher's schedules changed. So now, a science teacher might be pushing into a math class to address student need. Now nearly every teacher in the building helps to "push-in" to classes."

Finally, like Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South, ILCS-East uses the "Teacher Tracker" to track student academic achievement and then aggregate the data to code classroom teachers as either "red," for needing targeted support, "yellow" for push-in supports, and "green" for teachers who could offer support to their colleagues CAP goals at ILCS-East, are also determined using assessment data.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East uses a wide-variety of standardized and classroom based assessments, and disseminates the data quickly and in a useful manner to the teaching staff.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East uses standardized assessment data to improve instruction at the school-wide curricular level.

The teaching staff at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East are enthusiastic about the use of data to improve instruction, and use data in effective ways to improve instruction for their students.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are not accurate or useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are not received by classroom teachers in a timely or useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments lack sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is limited frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are not used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.
Meets standard	**The school: a) standardized and/or classroom assessments are accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives; b) assessment results are received by classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions; c) assessments have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities; d) there is sufficient frequency or use of assessments to inform instructional decisions effectively; e) assessment results are used to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum.**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy administers End of Course Assessments (ECA's) as well as the ACT Aspire assessment and Accuplacer, with additional classroom assessments administered by classroom instructors (indicators a & c). The ACT Aspire is taken twice a year and the results of these tests are made available to faculty to incorporate into curricular review, and the Accuplacer is given three times a year (indicator d). Focus group interviews with the ILCPA teaching staff revealed that they also perform in class assessments on a regular basis. When asked about data use in the school, the teaching staff described a process of daily informal assessments, such as do-nows, exit tickets and short quizzes, weekly assessments, as well as unit-based assessments that were a product of the Understanding by Design process of curriculum mapping. They use data as a professional community to encourage each other to address the standards in their classes, then assess for that standard and loop backwards if needed to cover it again. The curriculum map for the lessons needed to be looped into the next unit are then adjusted to address the student weakness uncovered by the assessment results (indicator e). The stated goal of this use of data is to ensure that ILCPA students are college ready, as is the goal of administering the Accuplacer, with the faculty noting that the focus on being college ready extended to the collaboration with Ivy Tech that allows students to take college credit courses.

Finally, like other Indianapolis Lighthouse schools, Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy uses the "Teacher Tracker" to tracks student academic achievement and then aggregates the data to code classroom teachers as either "red," for needing targeted support, "yellow" for push-

in supports, and "green" for teachers who could offer support to their colleagues CAP goals at ILCPA, are also determined using assessment data.

Areas of Strength: School uses a wide-variety of standardized and classroom based assessments, and disseminate the data quickly and in a useful manner to the teaching staff.

   School uses standardized assessment data to improve instruction at the school-wide curricular level and also at the student-level.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

	4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
Meets standard	**The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) hiring processes are organized and used to support the success of new staff members; b) the school deploys sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) is related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD opportunities are determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South has developed consistent hiring practices to ensure that all new hires are fully qualified. Mrs. Randall describes the process very localized to the specific school, with the school principal having a great deal of influence over teacher hiring. She explained that the applications come directly to the school principal, and with input from the relevant department head, she will choose several candidates for phone interviews. The candidates chosen from the phone interviews will then be asked to come to the school and give an art-infused lesson in either reading or math. This mini-lesson is observed by Mrs. Randall and members of the teaching staff. Other members of the staff will have the opportunity to meet the candidates afterward. The best candidates from this process may be asked back for additional interviews, or may be given asked to provide an example of their ability to analyze student data. The process, Mrs. Randall noted, is "in house and I have a lot of freedom to choose my staff."

New staff members are supported during their first year at ILCS-South with new faculty being assigned mentoring teacher to provide support and to discuss any problems or answer any questions that new staff members may have (indicator a). New staff members are also informally observed on a more frequent basis, and have additional coaching opportunities. All teachers at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South are certified or credentialed in their teaching area, or have the appropriate licensure to teach (indicator c). The teachers are teaching course loads that are

manageable, and the various staff members have distinct roles (indicator b). Overall, the teaching staff is deployed to best utilize their skills and training.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Academy-South teachers engage in professional development every morning for 30 minutes prior to the school day beginning. The professional development agenda is set at the beginning of the week based pm and staff and leadership work on the chosen issue for that week.

ILCS-South staff also have 4 full professional development days during the regular school year, and Mrs. Randall noted that more complex issues will often be covered during those sessions. Daily morning professional development is new this year for the ILCS-South staff, and some reservations have been expressed by the teaching staff regarding this schedule. Some noted that it was easier to fully engage with topics and with each other when PD occurred for several hours after school, while others noted that the early dismissal associated with after school PD was difficult for some students and parents to manage. The topics for the weekly professional development are determined on Mondays, or "data days." On each Monday student data is analyzed and as Mrs. Randall noted, " serves as the catalyst for what professional development consists of throughout the rest of the week. The data becomes the purpose for everything we do."

An additional use of student data is determining CAP (Culture of Achievement Plan) goals. CAP goals are created through the analysis of classroom observation data, with Danielson's Framework for Teaching serving as the observational rubric used. Goals such as increasing student engagement through higher level questioning, as measured by the LHA open response assessment, or increasing ELA proficiency, as measured on ISTEP, are driven by a combination of student data and classroom observation data. This data is brought to each grade level and/or coaching meeting and is used to help identify trends in student performance. This trend analysis is then used to plan professional development activities that will address the areas needing improvement.

Finally, each quarter, teachers complete an item analysis of their interim assessments and highlight incorrect answers. This analysis allows the teachers to determine which standards need to be retaught and reassessed, and interventionists determine which students need more time and support. Interventionists analyze their own data each quarter in order to form student groups and plan strategic lesson according to the student data. The teachers then complete action plans as a result of their analysis. As these examples make clear, professional development (PD) was related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement (indicator d) and PD opportunities were determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement (indicator e).

It was noted by several instructors that they would like to have more input into the topics chosen for professional development, with perhaps the opportunity to be surveyed regarding their interests and needs for additional information. As noted in Standard 4.3, some faculty members are not embracing the use of data in the classroom, suggesting that professional development in this area may be needed.

The teacher evaluation system used at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South is based a modified RISE system that is based on the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation system. The Bloomboard electronic templates and reporting system is used at ILCS-South (as well as the other Lighthouse schools). The Bloomboard system makes the classroom observation information available almost immediately to the teacher. Bloomboard also offers the evaluators the opportunity to "drop" additional notes and information on the form, allowing for a richer and more contextualized observation. During coaching meetings, the teacher evaluation scores and the appended notes can be shared and the teacher receiving the coaching can see the evidence for their score.

Mr. Harrison explained that he performs informal classroom observations on a regular basis, with the formal evaluative classroom observations performed by Mrs. Randall. In that way, as he noted, he is free to be a "true coach," and not an evaluator. Both Mrs. Randall and Mr. Harrison run coaching sessions with the teaching staff. The teaching staff reported that they viewed the teacher evaluation system as fair and rigorous, and all conveyed that they understood the system and that it was regularly implemented (indicator f).

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South offers high quality professional development for the teaching staff.

The teacher evaluation system used at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South is based on the Danielson model of teacher evaluation, and provides a well understood, fair and effective system of feedback for ILCS-South staff.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
Meets standard	**The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) hiring processes are organized and used to support the success of new staff members; b) the school deploys sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) is related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD opportunities are determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has developed consistent hiring practices to ensure that all new hires are fully qualified. New staff members are supported during their first year at ILCS-East with new faculty being assigned mentoring teacher to provide support and to discuss any problems or answer any questions that new staff members may have (indicator a). New staff members are also informally observed on a more frequent basis, and have additional coaching opportunities.   All teachers at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East are certified or credentialed in their teaching area, or have the appropriate licensure to teach (indicator c). The teachers are teaching course loads that are manageable, and the various staff members have distinct roles (indicator b), however, it was noted by the teaching staff that they will often find themselves pressed for time to engage in professional development opportunities, and will use time allotted for their preparation to help students. One teacher related that "I hesitate to to take a PD day because it will put someone else in a bad position if they have to cover my classroom-- we already work through lunches to have detentions in our classroom and use our prep time to be with kids." It is important to note that the choice to use their preparation period to tutor students, as well as using their lunch period to better implement the school discipline system, is a choice that the teachers make for themselves--it is not a job requirement placed upon them by ILCS-East leadership. The staff's willingness to use their prep and lunch periods to help their students is an example of their dedication to providing students with the best possible education.

Professional development at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East is related to demonstrated need for instructional improvement (indicator d). Mr. Pelych described the professional development opportunities as 2 weeks of full day PD prior to the start of the school year and 6 days spread throughout the school year. Based on an analysis of ISTEP data from the previous year, the ILCS-East leadership determined that the teachers and students would benefit from a focus on literacy skills. Consequently, ILCS-East contracted the services of a literacy specialist to provide two, 4 hour professional development, as well as two days of classroom observations, modeling of best-practices, and one-on-one meetings with teachers to provide differentiated feedback and strategies.

An example of professional development opportunities being determined through analysis of student achievement data (indicator e) can be seen in the use of Acuity data to develop action plans for re-teaching material where students failed to reach proficiency. Teachers were given student averages for each of the questions in Acuity and asked to identify common student misconceptions. Informed by the specific data from Acuity, the teaching staff developed strategies to re-teach the material and present them to the rest of the staff. Additionally, teachers were given an opportunity to work in grade level teams to discuss how cross-curricular instruction could aide in the re-teaching process.

Focus group interviews with the teaching staff revealed that the teachers would like additional opportunities to engage in professional development, with one teacher noting that "we need a LOT of professional development. A whole lot." The teaching staff attributed the need for professional development to competing time interests at the school level, with one teacher explaining, " Our schedule's changed because our buses have changed. A lot of the time that was built in organically for PD, we've given up. Most of it comes from a one-day-a-month. A lot of our collaboration time has been taken away. While the need for this is understandable, we would like to have that time back." Another teacher noted that "One thing we've started up is voluntary PD-like meetings after school with teachers. It's voluntary, but it is something we're trying to offer in the PD realm."

Leadership at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East have responded to the need to adjust the professional development to the bussing schedule by revising the weekly schedule to ensure that professional development is purposeful and timely. Mr. Pelych noted that "in addition to the weekly individualized data meetings, teachers also meet weekly with content area teams for 30 minutes and we hold weekly staff meetings in which we participate in a lesson plan peer review session that was developed based on our instructional weaknesses as identified by an analysis of our observation data. To make this time most purposeful, additional requirements were placed in the template of lesson plans focusing on: (1) Using questioning and discussion techniques, (2) Engaging students in learning, and (3) Using assessment in instruction. During the peer review sessions, all staff members work with content area teams to focus on providing critical feedback to improve lesson plans and overall instruction."

The teaching staff also reported that the school leadership was supportive of staff attending content area conferences and professional development opportunities. One teacher noted "I may seek out

professional development opportunities myself, or the administration may target opportunities for myself and others. I feel the administration does a good job of differentiating professional development opportunities for staff members, depending on the individual need....PD is targeted at a specific level, as opposed to general PD that isn't always relevant to staff members."

The modified RISE comprehensive teacher evaluation framework has been revised using techniques from the Danielson framework, and is currently being implemented at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East (indicator f). The teaching staff conveyed that they fully understood the teacher evaluation framework and found it to be an effective evaluation tool.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East supports individual staff members in their desire to develop as professionals through attending conferences and gaining expertise in their discipline.

Recommendations: The leadership of Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East is encouraged to seek feedback from the teaching staff regarding the most effective way to provide opportunities for additional student tutoring, as well as ways to provide professional development opportunities given the constraints of the current school schedule.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?	
Does not meet standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.**
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) hiring processes are not organized to support the success of new staff members; b) inefficient or insufficient deployment of faculty and staff limits instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are not certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) does not relate to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD is not determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is not explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) hiring processes are organized and used to support the success of new staff members; b) the school deploys sufficient number of faculty and staff to maximize instructional time and capacity; c) faculty and staff are certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned; d) professional development (PD) is related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement; e) PD opportunities are determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement; f) the teacher evaluation plan is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.

Significant Concerns were found in indicators d, e & f.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy has developed consistent hiring practices to ensure that all new hires are fully qualified. New staff members are supported during their first year at through the newly instituted departmental structure of the school (indicator a). Mr. Joel Thomas, Assistant Principal for Instruction, related that new teacher mentoring was the primary responsibility of the department chairs, with time set apart each week for meetings with the chair focused on the needs of the new staff member. New staff members are also informally observed on a more frequent basis, and have additional coaching opportunities. All teachers at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy are certified or credentialed in their teaching area, or have the appropriate licensure to teach (indicator c). The teachers are teaching course loads that are manageable, and the various staff members have distinct roles (indicator b). Overall, the teaching staff is deployed to best utilize their skills and training.

Teachers report that they have considerable opportunities to engage in professional development, with PD occurring on a daily basis for 30 minutes prior to the start of the school day. As was the case with the Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School staff, the ILCPA staff also expressed some concerns regarding the effectiveness of 30 minutes of professional development every day, rather than a less frequent, but longer, time period. They noted that sometimes the 30 minute professional

development only gave them enough time to introduce a concept, and did not give them the opportunity to "delve more into the PD and learn more about the application in the classroom."

Others noted that the consistency of a daily meeting prior to the school day was valuable, and gave them a chance to deal with "logistical issues," while others proposed that it was "good for the students" not to have time taken away from educational time during the week.

An additional observation made by the Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy staff was that much of the "whole group professional development" was not beneficial to everyone at ILCPA, given the wide spectrum of classroom experience in the faculty. They noted that "differentiated professional development" would benefit all. One teacher used as an example classroom management, point out that "The teachers who need the most (professional development) in classroom management need to spend a lot of time on it, but those who don't need it, it is repetitive. Last year there were more differentiated sessions because of the longer time period available." Another benefit of longer professional development periods, as suggested by one teacher, was the opportunity to "build staff culture. It gives us a couple of hours to get to know each other." It was unclear from interviews with the teaching staff and ILCPA leadership how professional development (PD) was related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement (indicator d) or how PD opportunities are determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement (indicator e).

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy is implementing a modified RISE system based on the Charlotte Danielson model. When asked about the teacher evaluation system, many of the teachers expressed frustration with both their understanding of the system and how it was being implemented. When asked if the evaluation system was clearly explained, one teacher replied "sort of-- they (the school leadership) took time to explain it, but I don't understand it." Another noted that "we have seen the explanations of the system and we have some problems with subjectivity." The Bloomboard system was also commented upon, with several staff noting that they had never been on Bloomboard, and those who had been on Bloomboard expressing confusion with the interface. The frequency of classroom walkthroughs and evaluations was also a point of frustration, with many teachers conveying that they either were not formally evaluated, or if they were, their results were not available to them. Only one teacher conveyed the experience of a positive evaluation, noting that "mine was done correctly and with Bloomboard. I could see how I was doing and why. When it is done correctly it is good." These comments suggest that Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparation Academy is not implementing a teacher evaluation plan that is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criterion (indicator f).

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy has access to an effective teacher evaluation plan in the revised RISE model based on the Danielson teacher evaluation system.

Recommendations: Professional development does not appear to be driven by student achievement data. Incorporating data into the professional development process would be valuable to both staff and students.

Providing both school-wide and individualized professional development opportunities that are "differentiated" for differing levels of expertise and teaching experience.

Correctly implementing the RISE teacher evaluation system is necessary in order to provide quality feedback to the ILCPA teaching staff.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South,

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy,
&
Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4.6. Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>both</u> of the following areas: a) significant disagreements exist among stakeholders about the school's mission; b) there is a lack of widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) significant disagreements exist among stakeholders about the school's mission; b) there is a lack of widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.
Meets standard	**The school: a) has a mission that is shared by all stakeholders; b) has stakeholders possessing widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.**

No significant concerns were found.

The school mission is well understood by all stakeholders at all levels, with the teaching staff at all three schools speaking eloquently regarding their personal missions at the Indianapolis Lighthouse schools. One teacher noted that "our students have no stability in their lives-- I want to be that stability for kids. They always ask "will you be here next year?" and I want to be here for them." One parent noted that "the teachers here are great--- they are hard working people and give more and more than teachers in other schools." It was also noted that all staff members at the Indianapolis Lighthouse Schools have a common goal of stay with the kids no matter what—they don't have enough people who actually care for them—being able to do that that keeps us going."

Other staff members stated that their mission is to " get the kids to college—I'm excited to be in this building (ILCPA) to see the students graduate from a successful high school." Others noted that "we want to give them more options---Work hard, get smart, get to college-- or if they decide that's not for them they have the ability to get what they want out of life."

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South, Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy & Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East have a compelling mission that is instantiated daily in the life of all three schools.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address them: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and/or unproductive.
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address it: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and /or unproductive.
Meets standard	**The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the school has clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach possesses high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive and faculty and students are clear about processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are professional and constructive.**

No significant concerns were found.

The Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South Scholar Family Handbook includes the description of a straightforward progressive discipline policy that is based on the SHINE social curriculum, which focuses on Self-Discipline, Humility, Intelligence, Nobility and Excellence. The description of the logical consequences tied to misbehaviors are included in the discipline policy. Logical consequences of student misbehavior can include apologies, mediation, the student "making it right, and escalates to In-School Suspensions, Out of School Suspensions and Expulsions. Consequently, the disciplinary policy has a clearly stated set of behavioral rules that enforce positive behavior (indicator a) and possesses high expectations for student behavior (indicator b). In addition to the logical consequences outlined in the Scholar Family Handbook, ILCS-South has added a focus on preventing the need for disciplinary actions. The have added Mr. Tim Grazian as Counselor to the staff, and his full time position is to provide positive behavioral supports to students who may be at risk for behavioral problems. Mr. Grazian & Mr. Kevin Butler, Director of School Culture for both Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South and Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy, supervise the AIR (Alternative Instructional Room), which is an alternative to In-School Suspension. The AIR room contains reading materials to promote reflection in the student, and when a student is in the AIR room he or she has access to counsel from Mr. Grazian, who works with the student on conflict resolution techniques as well as promotes active community membership. The student and Mr. Grazian will develop social goals for the student which will be shared with the classroom teacher, who will evaluate those goals and work with the student and Mr. Grazian to help the student to reach the goals. Additionally, teachers can send classwork to the AIR room for the student to work on while they work to reach an emotional state where they can return to class. Being sent to the AIR room is not a punishment per se, but an

opportunity for students to gather themselves emotionally before their actions result in a disciplinary consequence.

One goal of instituting the AIR room was to make the transition to the larger school that included students from Monument Lighthouse Charter School easier. When asked about the transition, the Deans of Student Services, Ms. Valerie Miller and Mr. Chad Taylor, replied that "we planned for the worst and it was not as big deal as we thought it would be." The only issue found with the AIR room was "changing the teacher mindset about the AIR room--teachers want to send the students there as a punishment, but it's not."

These new school culture initiatives were put in place to provide a proactive, rather than a reactive, response to student behaviors. As Mr. Taylor noted, " the problem with the old discipline way is that a child acts up on Monday and gets a consequence on Tuesday and the connection between the behavior and the consequence is lost. With the new system there is a connection and within an hour—the student is going through a process that gives them tools that they can use to get back into their classroom and get on with the day." The new system was described as "immediate and restorative" with the goal of "teaching them how to behave. In the past we just disciplined kids, but we've never taught them how to behave and what to do--- we didn't look at the root of the problem--we were reactive."

An additional component of the discipline system at ILCS-South is directed by Mr. Butler, whose role is to support the teachers and students when behavioral problems arise in either school. Mr. Butler will respond to requests from the teaching staff for support, or teachers will refer students to Mr. Butler's office for disciplinary action. When interviewed, Mr. Butler explained that he will use a set of different disciplinary consequence based on a variety of factors, before he would suspend students. Examples given included a warning, or a change of seat, a brief meeting with him to change their behavior. If the behavior continues then he will give the student after school detention, lunch detention, OSS, ISS or community service during lunch. Students are also given a behavior tracker, which for those students who need additional behavior supports, will contain daily goals for the student that are set by Mr. Miller and Ms. Taylor and the student. Each day the behavior tracker is checked off and then signed by the parents in the morning and then again in the evening. Mr. Butler was observed to have an easy rapport with the students, and from these informal observations it was clear that he works well with the students to implement the more traditional disciplinary consequences of suspensions, detentions and community service work.

 Thus, there appears to be two concurrent disciplinary system at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South. Once system is proactive and works to address the root of the misbehavior, be it social or academic, and the other is reactive and works along the lines of more traditional progressive discipline programs, with a series of consequences that escalate as the misbehavior escalates. Not surprisingly, these two systems lead to some confusion, with the teaching staff noting that "there doesn't seem to be a clear cut reason for being sent to the AIR room—if it's something ongoing or drastic and then you write that up in ED handbook and they (the school leadership) respond quickly."

This is not to say that the teaching staff is not supportive of the AIR classroom, when in fact they see it as an alternative to the more traditional discipline system that has not been producing the results that ILCS-South needs. One teacher explained, "When we have done everything we can in the classroom—The Handbook says it's a severe misbehavior and it's happening again and again, then the student gets lunch detention. But it all depends upon the child. For some, lunch detention will stop it (the misbehavior), but what if a child could care less? We used to suspend and suspend and suspend. But the zero tolerance idea—the same kids gets the same consequences over and over again- it gets frustrating." Another teacher replied, "we need to have a clear escalation process— why do we keep getting the same behaviors from the same students. We've gotten at the consequence, but not the why they are doing it."

While on the whole the teaching staff is supportive of the AIR room, there were frustrations expressed with the way it was being implemented at the time of the site visit. Specifically, at any given time the single AIR room is being used for students from kindergarten to Seniors in high school. As one teacher described the situation, "You can have a Kindergartener and an upset high school student in there at the same time, and the high school student is cussing in front of the 5 year old. They don't care, and it's hard to have a conversation with a child to try to get to the root of the problem with a high school student cussing right next to him."

The elementary school teachers noted that "we are using the AIR room for one reason and the high school is using it for another. The high school teachers are sending students for cussing, fighting, not cooperating, we are trying to get to the root of the problem with the child and there is a student from the high school there for punishment." This leads to overcrowding of the AIR room and students spilling out into the hallway on some occasions. Another teacher described the AIR room as "It's more like ISS when it gets that crowded. We see it working for the K-6 kids, but the added high school kids, in general don't have the same expectations. They (the school counselors) are in the process of changing how they counsel the students—they will pull them from the AIR room to an office—it's difficult to counsel a student in that atmosphere."

Despite the problems with the AIR room, the interactions between students and faculty were observed to be respectful and supportive (indicator c). Focus group interviews with the teaching staff were supportive of the excellent work Mr. Grazian and the school counselors have been doing, and the teaching staff reported that their K-6 students are, in the majority, respectful and eager to learn. The teaching staff did suggest that the current configuration of the AIR room be modified such that student from K-6 would be sent to one room, and high school students sent to their own AIR room. Email correspondences from Mr. Ryan Gall, Regional Vice President for Lighthouse Schools, Inc., communicated that the school leadership has in fact separated the two student populations and have provided each group with their own AIR room. This change will allow Mr. Grazian and the school counselors to provide counseling and build relationships with the K-6 students who need them. An additional change that was made regarding school culture was the assignment of Mr. Butler to be the Director of School Culture for only the Indianapolis Lighthouse

College Preparatory Academy, allowing him to focus his efforts on the improving the culture of the high school.

Interactions between Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South leadership and the teaching staff were observed to be supportive, professional and constructive. Mrs. Randall is new to ILCS-South but she has already made a positive impact on the outlook of the teaching staff, with many of them expressing optimism about the direction that ILCS-South is heading (indicator d).

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South has documented an easily understood progressive discipline policy, however, the school is currently changing the focus of their discipline policy and school culture to one that is more proactive and student centered, a change that holds great promise for the students of ILCS-South.

There are considerable student supports in place at Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South in the form of caring and dedicated teachers, a trained Counselor, as well as two Directors of Student Supports.

Recommendations: Continue the student-focused implementation of the AIR room, and continue to develop the student-centered, proactive discipline approach.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address them: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and/or unproductive.
Approaching standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address it: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and /or unproductive.**
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the school has clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach possesses high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive and faculty and students are clear about processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are professional and constructive.

Significant concerns were found in indicator c.

The Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has implemented a progressive discipline system that is well documented and is clearly stated in school documents (indicator a). The discipline policy includes clearly described minor discipline infractions, major discipline infractions, consequences for both types of infractions, and also describes the culture and relationships being fostered at ILCS-East. The documents also describe the Lighthouse Culture Center (LCC) where students are given the opportunity to work with the School Counselor and the LCC Coordinator to improve student behavior and choices. The LCC is not a punishment, but is instead intended as an opportunity to repair relationships and improve student behavior. The teaching staff reported that the Behavioral Intervention/SED Program documentation was provided to all at the beginning of the school year, that it was clear and concise and easy to understand. There was some confusion regarding the LCC expressed.

While interactions between students and faculty were observed to be respectful and supportive during the site visit, focus group interviews with the teaching staff and students revealed that there is confusion regarding the goal and use of the LCC, as well as inconsistencies in how the discipline policy is being implemented (indicator c). Specifically, the teaching staff reported that the school leadership will send a student back into a classroom after being sent out for an infraction if all of the steps of the Behavioral Intervention/SED Program are not implemented. One teacher explained, "I can do the 3-step process, but sometimes they (the student) are doing something that means learning can't happen-- so I send them out. But if I skip a step they get sent back very quickly and they could be back with the same kids they were getting ready to fight." The staff expressed the view that school leadership often sends students back to the classroom because the teacher skipped a step, or

because the leadership did not believe that the student should have been put out of the classroom for the described infraction.

The teaching staff also noted that the current discipline policy does not adequately address students who are continuously acting out. One teacher noted that "there doesn't seem to be place (in the discipline policy) for the kids who have continuously been a problem. Either they send the kids back to class or they do zero tolerance." They also noted that this particular problem leads to a "circular problem" in that the students are becoming aware of this issue and many are taking advantage. One teacher explained "The ones who know it (the circular nature of the problem) are the ones who are giving me the most trouble. They know that many phone numbers don't work, so there is another step that I can't do, and they know if they get sent down enough they will keep them for the day in LCC and they can miss classes." Another teacher noted "They (the LCC staff) have great processes for the students, but for some kids it becomes a crutch-- they are starting to request it when they need a break they will ask for LCC-- they are asking to get out of class."

An additional concern of the teaching staff is the lack of consistency in the application of the discipline policies. The teachers state that they are supportive of the individualized nature of the discipline policies designed for ILCS-East, noting that "we are trying to individualize the discipline-- it is dependent upon the student and their needs." However, they also noted that the students are aware that some students are treated differently and realize "who's who and what's what" in regard to different disciplinary outcomes. One teacher related an incident where a student argued that "Why did X (name redacted) get a different punishment than me for the same thing?" According to the teaching staff the students' perceptions are that the discipline system is applied inconsistently, a view that some of the teachers also share.

It is important to note that the teachers who spoke of the discipline policy did not express a negative view of the policy as a whole, rather they noted inconsistencies in application, and weaknesses in the policy that were discovered through implementation. Current problems with students who transferred from other schools into ILCS-East were noted, with the staff commenting on the difficulty of breaking "bad habits" learned at other schools, given the teachers perceived inability to "hold them accountable" for behaviors such as confronting the teachers with foul language or consistently acting out in class. These students are a particular concern because, as one teacher noted, "I fear that we are giving the wrong message by not being tougher and more consistent. These kids need to know what to expect, and they need to know what is going to happen to them at that point in time, not later." Several suggestion were made regarding changes to the discipline plan that the staff believed would be helpful, most notably, the inclusion of more academic incentives, possibly in the form of more positive behavior supports, to "inspire students academically." This view was supported by an examination of the ILCS-East Behavioral Intervention/SED Program which revealed that access to Club Lighthouse was based on an absence of negative behaviors (no more than one referral, no more than one unexcused absence) rather than on the presence of positive behaviors. Another suggestion made by the teaching staff was better defined consequences, and a clearer definition of behaviors that result in in-school suspension versus LCC. In response to

these concerns, Mr. Pelych has suggested that Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy would be implementing more processes to both acknowledge positive student behaviors, such as "student of the week" for outstanding students or "bag days" for positive behaviors, and also to clarify the implementation of the discipline system through more parental involvement. possibly through parental committees to help design positive educational incentives for their students.

Interactions between the teaching staff and the school leadership were respectful and supportive (indicator d), with the teaching staff speaking positively of the school leadership. There was, however, a consistent thread of stress underlying many of the comments made by the ILCS-East teaching staff during the focus groups. The teachers are fully invested in the mission of the school, but were expressing their concerns regarding the demands being placed upon them. Comments were often concerned with the length of the school day or with the challenges of teaching the ILCS-East student population. Specifically, teachers noted that "We feel like we don't have much of a break— the school year has gotten longer and the day is longer too. We don't have the support staff like other public schools—they need to acknowledge the high risk and high stress environment we work in." Another teacher noted that " We deal with more tragedy and more hardship than a traditional school" while another stated that "It's hard to be cussed at all the time--- it eventually gets to you."

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has developed a well-designed progressive discipline policy that, with some modifications, will serve ILCS-East well.

Recommendations: Clearly defined consequences for disciplinary infractions would benefit both the students and the teaching staff.

Implementing positive behavior supports, in addition to the progressive discipline currently being implemented, would increase students investment in their academic and social success at ILCS-East.

Involving the teaching staff in any modifications to the progressive discipline system or any positive behavior supports would give the teachers "ownership" of the school culture and possibly reduce some of the stress being created by the need to frequently discipline students.

Providing the ILCS-East teaching staff with more supports to help them deal with the stress of being at a new school that serves an at-risk population, possibly through community building exercises with students or as a professional staff.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.7. Is the school climate conducive to student and staff success?	
Does not meet standard	**The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address them: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and/or unproductive.**
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas with no evidence of a credible plan to address it: a) The school does not have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach does not possess high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are disrespectful and/or unsupportive and there are non-existing or unclear processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are unprofessional and /or unproductive.
Meets standard	The school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the school has clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior; b) the school's discipline approach possesses high expectations for student behavior; c) interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive and faculty and students are clear about processes for resolution of conflicts; d) interactions between faculty and administration are professional and constructive.

Significant concerns were found in indicators a, b, c &d.

The Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy, like both ILCS schools, uses the Scholar Family Handbook which includes the description of a straightforward progressive discipline policy comprised that is based on the SHINE social curriculum, which focuses on Self-Discipline, Humility, Intelligence, Nobility and Excellence. The description of the logical consequences tied to misbehaviors are included in the discipline behaviors that are punishable by suspensions or expulsions are also clearly described. Classroom observations and informal observations at ILCPA revealed however, that the disciplinary policy was not being consistently enforced to encourage positive behavior (indicator a), and that high expectations were not held by the school leadership (indicator b).

The behavior of students at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy were observed to be disrespectful to faculty, disrespectful and inappropriate to fellow students, and in many cases dangerous to themselves and the teaching staff. On at least one occasion a student was stopped by a teacher before she could strike another student, and for a moment the possibility existed that the student would strike the teacher instead. In several of the classrooms observed, students were talking, walking around the classroom, disrupting other students who were trying to work and coming and going from the classroom at will. As the teacher attempted to discipline one group of students another group of students that he had just disciplined became unruly. Students were observed walking through the halls during class periods, and one group of middle school students were observed making obscene gestures through an open classroom door to other students in the class.

An issue relating to the high school culture that was part of a long discussion in ILCS-South teacher focus groups was the impact of the high school students passing through the elementary school

hallway on their way to lunch in the first floor cafeteria. As described by one elementary school teacher, "the students are walking down the hallway as they transition to lunch and they are making a lot of noise and disrupting class. I pulled the students aside and ask them to quiet down and not use obscene language. They don't care--they will see you and they will cuss you out. One student said to me --If this is not what you want, go somewhere else. The elementary students cannot believe they just did that to you....Even the students responding in a friendly way will say you're not my teacher." When asked about the problem of the high school students disrupting the middle school, Mrs. Tooley, the principal of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy, noted that "they (the students) don't go to be a jerks, but at the end of the day they cuss—and it is a problem. But I can't stop it 24/7." In all, the school culture at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy was not conducive to student or staff success, and the interactions between students and faculty were not respectful and supportive (indicator c).

Focus group interviews with the teaching staff were informative regarding their view of the problems with the school culture of ILPCA. Several teachers noted that the influx of older students from Monument Lighthouse Charter School had completely disrupted what had been a functioning school culture. They noted that the Monument students were often behind in their academics and consequently the students, not having the basic skills to perform at the level of the ILPCA students, are acting out of frustration. A positive sign is that many of the Monument Lighthouse students are staying for the afterschool tutoring and have displayed an eagerness to learn and take advantage of what ILPCA has to offer. However, many students in the afterschool tutoring, as recounted by the teaching staff, are simply there because their friends have stayed after for tutoring. These students can be a disruptive influence.

Regarding the Monument Lighthouse students, it is important to note that the influx of students from Monument Lighthouse to Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter Academy and Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy was well prepared for and, overall, went very smoothly. The teachers and the students both reported very few instances of aggression between students of the two schools, and while the teaching staff reported that at the beginning of the semester there was some stress at the high school between students from the two campuses, on the whole it has decreased substantially. There have been some points of stress for the Monument Lighthouse student: as noted above, many of them came to ILCS-South and ILCPA behind academically and are working to catch up. Also, the former Monument students have not formed strong relationships with the ILCS and ILCPA teaching staff, and, as reported by the students, they had come to believe that the ILCPA staff does not believe that they are capable of the schoolwork being asked of them. For this reason, as reported by the students, the Monument students pushed back on the faculty and became disciplinary issues.

Other teachers noted that the influx of students the year previous (the 2013-14 school year) had also led to disruptions in what had been a well functioning school culture , with one noting "that's part of the process-- it happened before when we added a lot of students. They disrupt the dominant culture that we had set up." Other teachers noted that in the past the first few days of school were

set aside for student orientation, but this was not done in this academic year. They suggested that the orientation process would have benefitted students in this year of change and transition.

In addition to an influx of new students, Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy also has a new principal, Mrs. Cathy Tooley. When asked about the discipline and school culture at ILCPA, Mrs. Tooley conveyed that she was aware of the problems, but that she has been working closely with Mr. Butler to implement the school discipline policy, which she referred to as the "stairsteps of discipline." According to Mrs. Tooley, Mr. Butler, as Director of School Culture, was responsible for the implementation of the discipline policy. Mrs. Tooley also expressed the opinion that the specifics of the discipline policy should be decided by the teaching staff, noting that " In the past the leadership team set the goals and they don't ask the teachers... I put the teachers on a subcommittee and put the discipline data in font of them and they formed the goals. The teachers will report back to me and will be held accountable for the achievement of the goal."

The teaching staff expressed a general discontent with the belief that they should be setting the specific discipline goals, and in particular, that some crucial discipline issues were to be left to individual teachers to decide. An example that was mentioned many times was the lack of a comprehensive, school-wide cell phone policy. At the time of the site visit, cell phone use was set by each individual classroom teacher, with some teachers allowing cell phones and others banning their use in their classroom. One teacher expressed the frustration, " I'm unsure of what steps to take about phones, and the students can get away with things in some classes-- like their cell phones-- and not in others. Students come into my class with their phones out and tell me they won't put them away because they were allowed to use them in their other class."

Regarding the practice of sending disruptive students out of class, one teacher noted, "I don't send students to the office.. they send the kids back and tell us they feel we haven't done enough to handle them." Another teacher related that "I sent two girls out of my class and neither of them went to the office. There were not repercussions.. nothing. There is a lack of administrative follow through... and even when they go to the office they are back in class the next period. And they come back to class angry and hot....the wrath when they come back."

The lack of administrative follow through was particularly upsetting to the teaching staff. One teacher described the situation as "The administration wants to ask "What can the teacher be doing differently, not what the administration could be doing differently. They have an idea of a school culture, but we don't have the leadership to make it a reality."

There is also a lack of trust and respect between the elementary school teachers and the high school teachers. During focus group interviews the elementary school teachers related that they believe that the high school teachers do not respect what they do or appreciate the work being done at the elementary level. The elementary teaching staff also believes that all their hard work instilling good work habits and behaviors in their students come to nothing once their students reach middle school because "7-12 culture is chaos. Something happens once the get up there and they lose everything we've taught them. They become different kids."

Regarding the interactions between faculty and the administration, the teaching staff reported that their relationship with Mrs. Tooley was not friendly and professional, and that the teachers themselves did not have good relationships with each other. One described a culture in which "two teachers can walk past each other in the hallway and not talk to each other." They also noted that the lines of communication between the teaching staff and the principal were not effective with important procedural details, often about the school discipline policy, being changed without the changes being communicated effectively to the teaching staff. This practice, coupled with a lack of feedback on classroom practices, left the teaching staff feeling distant from the principal. This feeling of being disconnected from the leader of the school was exacerbated by the practice of delegating important school duties, such as curriculum development and the dissemination of school policies, to others.

It was quite clear during the site visit that the school culture at Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy was not conducive to either student or faculty success, a fact that was not lost on the Lighthouse Schools leadership. Subsequent to the site visit, Mr. Gall removed Mrs. Tooley as Principal of ILCPA, and Mr. Jyati is now the Principal of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy.

Areas of Strength: Changes that have recently been made , most notably the AIR room for the high school students and limiting Mr. Butler's responsibilities to the high school, are a good beginning and should lead to positive results.

Recommendations: The design and implementation of a simple and well documented discipline policy is essential. Most importantly, the policy must be conveyed to students and staff alike and must be consistently applied across the high school.

The entire school staff, Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South and Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy, need to engage in team building exercises in order to establish an attitude of trust and respect among the faculty in order for the Indianapolis Lighthouse schools to be a true K-12 model, and not simply two schools sharing one building.

Student and staff orientation days should be re-instituted in order to build community across all students-- new transfers and continuing students alike.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South

4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Meets standard	**The school: a) has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) utilizes communications that are both timely and relevant to the parental concerns; c) communicates student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents; d) the school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., communicating in parents' native languages, not communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at convenient times for parents).**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents (indicator a), with the teaching staff using a variety of ways to communicate with parents. These communications take the form of school newsletters, classroom newsletters from each teacher, behavior reports send home daily or weekly, parent-teacher conferences held four times a year, phone messenger systems, emails, phone calls and face to face discussions. All of these communications methods are used throughout the school year (indicator b). The teachers noted that the content of communication with parents are substantive and valuable for both teachers and parents and that communicating with parents was an expectation of the school leadership. As one teacher noted "Parent involvement is up to the teacher-- it's a 100 percent expectation that they keep in contact with parents." Another explained that "sometimes parent involvement is us calling and calling, and we do home visits if we need to. We use emails, texts, phone calls." It was also noted that they communicate with parents whenever there is a behavior plan put in place, and that parents can monitor student progress and behavior in PowerSchool.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents through parent/teacher conferences in which teachers explain grades and test results from Acuity and ISTEP. Additionally, progress reports are sent home at a minimum of once per quarter and some teachers choose to communicate with parents more frequently, providing parent with a steady flow of information.

The school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (indicator d), with many school materials translated into Spanish. Further, teachers offer extended times to meet with parents during conference week, or will come into school early, schedule meetings during school hours and after hours.

Focus group meetings with parents revealed that they are happy with the quality and amount of communication provided by ILCS-South. They noted that the teaching staff communicates with them using a variety of methods, including email, phone calls and conversations during drop-off and pick-up. Mrs. Randall has expressed the desire for more parent engagement at ILCS-South, and is working to provide more opportunities for parents to be involved at the school. While she noted that 88% of parents attended parent-teacher conferences, transportation to the school on regular basis is difficult for parents, many of whom live in neighborhoods far from the school's southside location.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South staff are friendly and responsive to parents, providing them with a information about their students through a variety of different modes of communication.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East

4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Meets standard	**The school: a) has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) utilizes communications that are both timely and relevant to the parental concerns; c) communicates student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents; d) the school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., communicating in parents' native languages, not communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at convenient times for parents).**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents (indicator a), with the teaching staff using a variety of ways to communicate with parents. These communications take the form of school newsletters, classroom newsletters from each teacher, behavior reports send home daily or weekly, parent-teacher conferences held four times a year, phone messenger systems, emails, phone calls and face to face discussions. All of these communications methods are used throughout the school year (indicator b). The teachers noted that the content of communication with parents are substantive and valuable for both teachers and parents.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents through parent/teacher conferences in which teachers explain grades and test results from Acuity and ISTEP. Additionally, progress reports are sent home at a minimum of once per quarter and some teachers choose to communicate with parents more frequently, providing parent with a steady flow of information. Finally, parents can access their students' grades on Powerschool.

The school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (indicator d), with many school materials translated into Spanish. Further, teachers offer extended times to meet with parents during conference week, or will come into school early, schedule meetings during school hours and after hours.

Focus group meetings with parents revealed that they are happy with the quality and amount of communication provided by ILCS-East. One concern that was expressed, however, derives from the transitions the school underwent in the previous academic year. Several of the parents in the focus group had students from Monument Lighthouse Charter School, and felt as though they had not been adequately informed or listened to during that change. As one parent noted " We were blindsided by Monument closing. We weren't told anything. We want to make sure something like that doesn't happen again. Communication is better and we want to keep it that way." It is important to note that parents feel that communication in the current school year is very good, and while there may have been adequate communication in the previous year regarding the closure of Monument Lighthouse Charter School, it is a concern of the parents moving forward that they be adequately informed of any future changes.

 Regarding the quality of the education being offered at ILCS-East, all of the parents interviewed were enthusiastic about the school, saying "I like the school as a whole. I'm very happy with it" or "All the problems they had, seem like they're all gone," and "This is the best way I can say it: My kids would not have had the same education in Arlington, Marshall, or somewhere else."

Areas of Strength   Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East staff are friendly and responsive to parents, providing them with a information about their students through a variety of different modes of communication.

Recommendations: Maintain or increase the level of communication with parents, particularly regarding the upcoming changes at ILCS-East as the school transitions to operating under its own charter.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and parents clear and helpful?	
Does not meet standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Approaching standard	The school presents significant concerns in <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) there is a lack of active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) school communication is neither timely nor relevant to the parental concerns; c) student academic progress and achievement reports are not clearly reported and/or misunderstood; d) the school's communication methods are not well-designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., not communicating in parents' native languages, communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at inconvenient times for parents).
Meets standard	**The school: a) has active and ongoing communication between the school and parents; b) utilizes communications that are both timely and relevant to the parental concerns; c) communicates student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents; d) the school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (e.g., communicating in parents' native languages, not communicating only in writing when many parents cannot read, holding meetings at convenient times for parents).**

No significant concerns were found.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy have active and ongoing communication between the school and parents (indicator a), with the teaching staff using a variety of ways to communicate with parents. These communications take the form of school newsletters, classroom newsletters from each teacher, behavior reports send home daily or weekly, parent-teacher conferences held four times a year, phone messenger systems, emails, phone calls and face to face discussions. All of these communications methods are used throughout the school year (indicator b). The teachers noted that the content of communication with parents are substantive and valuable for both teachers and parents.

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents through parent/teacher conferences in which teachers explain grades and test results. Additionally, progress reports are sent home at a minimum of once per quarter and some teachers choose to communicate with parents more frequently, providing parent with a steady flow of information. Finally, parents can access their students' grades on Powerschool.

The school's communication methods are designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents (indicator d), with many school materials translated into Spanish. Further, teachers offer extended times to meet with parents during conference week, or will come into school early, schedule meetings during school hours and after hours. Focus group meetings with parents revealed that they are happy with the quality and amount of communication provided by ILCPA . They noted that the

teaching staff communicates with them using a variety of methods, including email, phone calls and conversations during drop-off and pick-up.

Areas of Strength: Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy staff are friendly and responsive to parents, providing them with a information about their students through a variety of different modes of communication.

Recommendations: None at this time.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South,

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East &

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

	4.9. Do the school's special education files demonstrate that it is in legal compliance and is moving towards best practice?
Does not meet standard	**The school's special education files present concerns in <u>two or more</u> of the following areas: a) services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) do not adequately match the exceptional needs of the student; b) each need identified within the IEP does not have a corresponding goal and plan for assessment; c) all goals are not rigorous or based on state or national learning standards; d) evidence does not demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student developed; e) specifically designed curriculum is not outlined.**
Approaching standard	The school's special education files present concerns in <u>one</u> or more of the following areas: a) services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) do not adequately match the exceptional needs of the student; b) each need identified within the IEP does not have a corresponding goal and plan for assessment; c) all goals are not rigorous or based on state or national learning standards; d) evidence does not demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student developed; e) specifically designed curriculum is not outlined.
Meets standard	<u>All</u> of the following are evident in the school's special education files: a) services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs of the student; b) each need identified within the IEP has a corresponding goal and plan for assessment; c) each goal is rigorous and is based on state and national learning standards; d) explicit evidence exists to demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student develops; e) specifically designed curriculum is outlined.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Academy: Fall, 2014

Special Education Audit

Azure DS Angelov, Ph.D.

This report compiles a review of all practices and procedures specific to special education services at Indianapolis Lighthouse Academy. The results of this evaluation are based on the following pieces of data collected: classroom observations, review of internal processes and procedural manuals, interviews with general education and special education staff, students with IEPs, review of 25% of IEPs housed at the Indianapolis Lighthouse, DOE data bases, Indianapolis Lighthouse's website, and follow up interviews with families of students with IEPs at Indianapolis Lighthouse.

Not all of the following are evident in the school's special education files: (a) services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs of the student; (b) each need identified within the IEP has a corresponding goal and plan for assessment; (c) each goal is rigorous and is based on state and national learning standards; (d) explicit evidence exists to demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student develops; (e) specifically designed curriculum is outlined.

Indianapolis Lighthouse is in a time of transition. Merging several schools into one building is not an easy task. For special education specifically, navigating a shared physical space while bridging philosophical and procedural differences is emerging as a challenge that needs attention. There was a consistent pattern of inconsistency across all indicators (4.9 a, b, c, d, & e). In most cases the elementary program was compliant, while the secondary program was not. Transition plans and services were especially problematic. A comprehensive vision and organizational structure for k-12 special education is a necessary next step for Indianapolis Lighthouse.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South,

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East &

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy

4.10. Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with limited English proficiency?	
Does not meet standard	The school is <u>not</u> fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ESL students, and requires substantial improvement in order to achieve conditions such as the following: a) appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation research and effective practices relating to the provision of ESL services; b) relationships with students, parents, and external providers that are well-managed and comply with law and regulation.
Approaching standard	The school is not yet completely fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding ESL students, and requires *some* (but not considerable) improvement to fully achieve conditions such as the following: a) appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of ESL services; b) relationships with students, parents, and external providers that are well-managed and comply with law and regulation.
Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ESL students, as indicated by conditions such as the following: a) appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of ESL services; b) relationships with students, parents, and external providers that are well-managed and comply with law and regulation.

Not applicable.

According to the Indianapolis Lighthouse Special Education Coordinator, Travis Campbell, there are no students at the Lighthouse campuses who are below intermediate and advanced fluency in English.

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South Classroom Observation Summary

Two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-South using the instrument provided by the Office of Education Innovation. Classroom observers spent 3.87 hours (232 minutes) observing 8 classrooms, 171 students, and 8 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 28 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 21:1.

Classroom Environment

75% (6/8) had posted objectives. 100% (8/8) had posted state standards. 100% (8/8) used critical vocabulary. 100% (8/8) had challenging content. 0% (0/8) exhibited differentiation. 0% (0/8) of the instruction observed built on prior knowledge.

Learning Environment

The observers categorized observed learning experiences into four main categories. 75% (6/8) of observed activities were Remember/Understand Activities. 87% (7/8) were Apply/Perform Activities. 25% (2/8) was Analyze/Evaluate Activities. 12% (1/8) were Create/Design Activities 12% (1/8) of activities were found to be ineffective.

100% (8/8) of classrooms contained rich print materials. 50% (4/8) showed examples of exemplary work. 87% (7/8) displayed a daily schedule. 87% (7/8) had posted behavior expectations. 100% (8/8) had culturally relevant materials.

Behavior Management

The site team observed proactive and reactive techniques. The site team recorded 8 (100%) classrooms using proactive discipline. 8 (100%) classrooms using reactive discipline were recorded. Student engagement was fairly consistent. Please see the table below.

Proportion of Students Engaged During:	All		Most		Half		Few		None	
	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total
First Interval	1	12%	6	75%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%
Second Interval	1	12%	6	75%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%
Third Interval	1	12%	6	75%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East Classroom Observation Summary

On November 6 & 7, 2014, two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School-East. Classroom observers spent 4.6 hours (279 minutes) observing 9 classrooms, 159 students, and 9 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 31 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 18:1.

Classroom Environment

78% (7/9) had posted objectives. 44% (4/9) had posted state standards. 78% (7/9) used critical vocabulary. 88% (8/9) had challenging content. 0% (0/9) exhibited differentiation. 33% (3/9) of the instruction observed built on prior knowledge.

Learning Environment

The observers categorized observed learning experiences into four main categories. 66% (6/9) of observed activities were Remember/Understand Activities. 100% (9/9) were Apply/Perform Activities. 11% (1/9) was Analyze/Evaluate Activities. 0% (0/9) were Create/Design Activities 11% (1/9) of activities were found to be ineffective.

33% (3/9) of classrooms contained rich print materials. 77% (7/9) showed examples of exemplary work. 77% (7/9) displayed a daily schedule. 100% (9/9) had posted behavior expectations. 44% (4/9) had culturally relevant materials.

Behavior Management

The site team observed proactive and reactive techniques. The site team recorded 9 (100%) classrooms using proactive discipline. 9 (100%) classrooms using reactive discipline were recorded. Student engagement was fairly consistent. Please see the table below.

Proportion of Students Engaged During:	All		Most		Half		Few		None	
	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total
First Interval	1	11%	4	44%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%
Second Interval	0	0%	5	55%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%
Third Interval	0	0%	5	55%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%

Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy Classroom Observation Summary

Six classrooms were observed using the instrument provided by the Office of Education Innovation On November 4 & 5, 2014, two observers conducted classrooms observations during the 4th year review of Indianapolis Lighthouse College Preparatory Academy. Classroom observers spent 3 hours (174 minutes) observing 6 classrooms, 222 students, and 6 teachers. On average, each observation lasted 29 minutes and the observed student to teacher ratio was 22:1.

Classroom Environment

66% (4/6) had posted objectives. 0% (0/6) had posted state standards. 100% (6/6) used critical vocabulary. 83% (5/6) had challenging content. 0% (0/6) exhibited differentiation. 66% (4/6) of the instruction observed built on prior knowledge.

Learning Environment

The observers categorized observed learning experiences into four main categories. 83% (5/6) of observed activities were Remember/Understand Activities. 83% (5/6) were Apply/Perform Activities. 0% (0/6) was Analyze/Evaluate Activities. 0% (0/6) were Create/Design Activities 0% (0/6) of activities were found to be ineffective.

75% (5/6) of classrooms contained rich print materials. 33% (2/6) showed examples of exemplary work. 83% (5/6) displayed a daily schedule. 100% (6/6) had posted behavior expectations. 0% (0/6) had culturally relevant materials.

Behavior Management

The site team observed proactive and reactive techniques. The site team recorded 4 (75%) classrooms using proactive discipline. 6 (100%) classrooms using reactive discipline were recorded. Student engagement was fairly consistent. Please see the table below.

Proportion of Students Engaged During:	All		Most		Half		Few		None	
	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total	#	% Total
First Interval	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Second Interval	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Third Interval	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%